

Meeting Invitees	Attended	Meeting Invitees	Attended
Giorgio Apollinari	X	Elaine McCluskey	X
Jeff Appel	X	Randy Ortgiesen	X
Pepin Carolan	X	Gina Rameika	
Paul Derwent	X	Vladimir Shiltsev	
Roger Dixon		Ed Temple	X
Peter Garbincius		Bob Webber	X
Bill Griffing	X	Additional Attendees	
Nancy Grossman	X	Don Cossairt	X
Dean Hoffer	X		
Steve Holmes	X		
Bob Kephart	X		
Young-Kee Kim	X		

ACTION ITEMS AS A RESULT OF THIS MEETING:

New Action Items	Person Responsible
Determine how quickly NSLS-II has achieved its CD's	D Hoffer/E McCluskey
Add NEPA coordinator to project staffing list	D Hoffer
Add Computing Division & PPD to invitation list for next meeting	E McCluskey

Agenda and Presentation slides for this meeting can be found at

http://www.fnal.gov/directorate/OPMO/Projects/PX/WGM/2008/08_28/mtg.htm

Handouts: DOE O 413.3, Office of Science PM Decision/Approval Matrix (updated 6/24/08), and DOE Actions Authorized by CD Approval (updated 2/2/07). Other documents were shown in paper format but not distributed.

1. Fermilab PM Working Group Meetings **see Temple slides**
 - a. PED funds – HEP has never had a project use this type of funding before, which may delay CD-0 if this pool has not been budgeted in the program office in that year.
 - b. Cannot use operating funds for design after CD-1, however, could likely do R&D on R&D operating funds at that time.
 - c. Discussion of whether conceptual design precludes anymore R&D. Pepin noted that in new DOE Office of Science Management System Procedure on Project Management (section 3.1.2, Project Delivery), it's stated that science projects' are different in that R&D usually continues after conceptual design complete.
2. Project X Scope (including Coordination with Related Programs and exclusion of DUSEL and Elimination of NuMI from PX Scope for CD-0) **see Holmes slides**
 - a. Regarding how to include 8 GeV capability in scope of the project, Young-Kee suggested that option 2, choose an experiment (mu2e phase two) and develop a scenario for the delivery of beam based on their requirements, is probably the best way to go.
3. Status of Initial Configuration Document **see Derwent slides**
4. Project Timeline **see Hoffer slides**

- a. Question asked as to why has construction in FY12 been eliminated from consideration? Answer is that continuing resolution and budget issue realities, resource limitations, and times for design + reviews stretch out the timeline.
 - b. Discussion of when and where collaborators should be included in actual planning. Acquisition strategy, PEP, and best included by CD-1.
 - c. Noted that contingency may have to be included by the project for in-kind contributions in case those don't appear.
 - d. Noted that if DOE wants to push getting a project going (CD-0), they can make it happen. NSLS-II cited as an example.
5. Project Staffing, Including Project Office Support and Subproject Managers **see Hoffer slides**
- a. Noted that risk management is much higher profile than was on NuMI.
 - b. NEPA responsibility should also be added to staffing list.
6. Planning for CD-0 Review **see Hoffer slides**
7. NEPA Planning and Approach **see Griffing slides**
- a. Noted that NEPA process must be complete by CD-2
8. Document Database Planning **see McCluskey slides**
- a. Question of why Computing Division chose not to support Invenio? Steve agreed this and Sharepoint should be discussed at higher management level.

In general, Young-Kee suggested that a "lab-wide" presentation on the Critical Decision process for projects could be useful for engineers and scientists not familiar with the process.

Next meeting will be in approximately one month.